

REMARKS

By the above actions, claims 1 and 7 have been amended. In view of these actions and the following remarks, reconsideration of this application is requested.

Claims 1 and 3 have been rejected based upon the combination of the disclosures of the Notelteirs and Satterfield patents, while claims 2 and 4-6 were rejected over these references when viewed further in light of the Gotoh et al. patent and claims 7-10 when the Notelteirs and Satterfield patents are viewed in combination with the Goettler patent. These rejections are inappropriate, especially as they may relate to the claims as now presented for the following reasons.

Firstly, the Notelteirs patent merely discloses a conventional lamp of the type to which the present invention is directed as an improvement. That is, Notelteirs merely discloses the use coatings of standard corrosion resisting materials, such as nickel, platinum, palladium, gold, and iridium on a primer layer of nickel or copper (col. 2, lines 21-24). As recognized by the Examiner, no teaching exists as to the use of a crystalline molybdate coating.

As for the Satterfield patent, it discloses a "temporary" protective coating in which 2 to 3 wt. % of crystalline molybdate can form an optional component as a flux (last full paragraph, col. 4). Since Satterfield's fused coatings "spall" upon cooling of the heat-treated workpiece, i.e., "they separate at the interface of the metal and the fused composition and are readily removed from the metal surface" (col. 6, lines 50-53), they are totally unsuitable for use as a coating for the molybdenum conductors of Notelteirs since his lamp is heated during use and cools in between each use. Furthermore, not only are Satterfield's coatings clearly unsuitable for use in Notelteirs' lamp, but Satterfield teaches his composite for use as a coating for steel (see examples) and nowhere suggests that the coating would be suitable for use on molybdenum. Still further, Satterfield's coating cannot be considered to have crystalline molybdate "as the primary material" when only 2 to 3 wt. % of the coating is crystalline molybdate.

Thus, it would not be obvious to combine the Notelteirs and Satterfield disclosures in the manner proposed by the Examiner, and even if such were done, it would not yield the presently claimed invention.

Turning now to the Gotoh et al. patent relied upon by the Examiner with respect to claims 2 and 4-6, first of all, in rejecting claim 5, the Examiner failed to address the recitation that it is

the "*primary material*" of the protective coating, i.e., the crystalline molybdate, that has the indicated crystalline structure, and as pointed out above, that is not the case for the coating of Satterfield, and no crystalline molybdate coatings are taught by the Gotoh et al. patent. Thus, even if it were obvious to apply the roughness teachings of the Gotoh et al. patent as proposed by the Examiner, those teachings could not overcome the basic deficiencies of the combination of the Notelteirs and Satterfield patents.

Still further, the Gotoh et al. disclosure relates to a wiring board and process for its production in which the disclosed surface roughness cited by the Examiner is to achieve "easy bonding of a resin layer 106 such as a prepreg or a resist to the upper surface of the conductor layer 102 by an anchor effect." Clearly, Gotoh et al. constitutes nonanalogous prior art, not being directed to the lamp field of the present invention and Notelteirs, nor being directed to the problem that the present invention is directed toward of providing high temperature corrosion resistance in a foil seal lamp environment.

Similarly, the Goettler patent also constitutes nonanalogous prior art. That is, Goettler is directed to the production of ceramic composites formed of a ceramic matrix and an additional material having the general formula ABO_4 which is used as a reinforcement embedded in the ceramic matrix. In the case of molybdates, B represents the molybdate and A represents a divalent cation (col. 1, first paragraph; see also, col. 4, lines 33-35 and 50-60). Such is outside the field of the inventor's endeavor (lamps) and is unrelated to the problem sought to be solved of providing high temperature corrosion resistance in a foil seal lamp environment.

Moreover, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, rather than suggesting that the molybdate be the primary material, Goettler teaches the exact opposite since the molybdate is disclosed as being in a ceramic matrix and being comprised of "one of continuous fibers, discrete particles, laminae, and whiskers" (col. 4, lines 55-60). Clearly, the molybdate being in the form of a reinforcement in a ceramic matrix would indicate that the primary material is the ceramic matrix, not the reinforcement. Thus, even if by some stretch of the imagination Goettler could be considered to have any relevance to Notelteirs and the present invention, its teachings could not possibly lead one of ordinary skill in the art to the present invention.

Accordingly, it should now be clear that no possible combination of any or all of the references relied upon by the Examiner could possibly lead one of ordinary skill to the subject

matter disclosed and claimed by the present applicant. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections under § 103 are in order and are now requested.

The prior art that has been cited, but not applied by the Examiner has been taken into consideration during formulation of this response. However, since this art was not considered by the Examiner to be of sufficient relevance to apply against any of the claims, no detailed comments thereon are believed to be warranted at this time.

While the present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, should the Examiner find some issue to remain unresolved, or should any new issues arise, which could be eliminated through discussions with applicant's representative, then the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone in order that the further prosecution of this application can thereby be expedited.

Lastly, it is noted that a separate Extension of Time Petition accompanies this response along with a deposit account authorization for payment of the requisite extension of time fee. However, should that petition become separated from this Amendment, then this Amendment should be construed as containing such a petition and authorization for the required payment applied to Deposit Account No. 19-2380 (740145-269).

Respectfully submitted,



David S. Safran
Registration No. 27,997

NIXON PEABODY LLP
Suite 900
401 9th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20004-2128

Telephone: (703) 827-8094

DSS:kmm

W678322.1